**Programmable Currency and Economic Control: How CBDCs Could Reshape Freedom, Privacy, and Power**

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

April 13, 2025

As Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) move closer to mainstream adoption, a deeper conversation is emerging around their potential to reshape the global financial system. Far more than digital versions of cash, CBDCs introduce programmability—allowing governments to set conditions on how, when, and where money is spent. This paper explores how such programmable features may offer efficiency and control to central authorities, while raising profound concerns about individual freedom, financial autonomy, and privacy. We examine how tools like programmed expiration and purchase restrictions, often presented as public policy innovations, may instead become instruments of behavioral coercion. Meanwhile, the ultra-wealthy—protected by diversified assets, legal structures, and geopolitical mobility—may remain unaffected, reinforcing systemic inequality. As CBDCs emerge globally, with mixed responses from policymakers, privacy advocates, and civil society, the stakes grow increasingly clear. This paper argues that the widespread adoption of programmable currency may not democratize finance, but redefine it—establishing a two-tier system where liberty is unevenly distributed and economic control is codified into the fabric of everyday transactions.

Keywords: CBDC, programmable money, digital currency, financial autonomy, central bank digital currency, surveillance, economic control, programmable currency, expiration of money, purchase restrictions, Eswar Prasad, digital yuan, privacy, financial inclusion, inequality, legal structures, ultra-wealthy, digital finance, behavioral economics, monetary policy. A collaboration with GPT-4o.
CC4.0.

## I. Introduction

In recent years, the concept of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) has emerged at the forefront of global financial discourse. A CBDC is a digital form of a country's fiat currency, issued and regulated directly by its central bank. Unlike decentralized cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin, CBDCs are centralized, government-backed, and typically envisioned as legal tender, functioning alongside or replacing physical cash.

While the primary narrative surrounding CBDCs emphasizes increased efficiency, financial inclusion, and innovation, the underlying technology enables a far more consequential feature: programmability. Unlike cash—which is anonymous, fungible, and unrestricted—programmable digital currencies can be coded with specific rules. These rules might determine when, where, how, and on what the digital money can be spent, or even cause it to expire if not used within a certain time frame.

This paper explores the dual-edged nature of programmable CBDCs. On the one hand, they offer governments and central banks new tools for economic policy and financial oversight. On the other hand, they raise serious concerns about financial autonomy, surveillance, and control over personal behavior. A key tension lies in the asymmetry of impact: while CBDCs could constrain the economic agency of everyday citizens, the ultra-wealthy—through asset diversification, legal structures, and jurisdictional arbitrage—may remain almost entirely unaffected.

What emerges is the possibility of a two-tiered economic system: one where programmable money is used to shape, direct, or even coerce the financial behavior of the majority, and another in which a small elite class continues to operate in relative freedom outside the reach of such controls. This paper aims to examine the design, potential applications, and broader implications of programmable CBDCs, and to raise critical questions about who will truly be free in a world where money itself can be programmed.

## II. The Rise of Programmable Money

Money has long been regarded as a neutral medium of exchange—a socially agreed-upon mechanism to facilitate trade, store value, and measure economic worth. From early forms like shells and metal coins to modern fiat currencies, money has historically functioned with a level of autonomy from centralized control once it enters circulation. Even with the introduction of credit and banking systems, once funds were transferred, they were largely out of the sender's control, and certainly not subject to direct, granular manipulation by governments or issuers.

The digital age, however, has progressively eroded this neutrality. The shift from physical cash to digital transactions—credit cards, online banking, mobile payments—has already increased the visibility and traceability of personal financial behavior. Payment processors, financial institutions, and governments now routinely collect and analyze transaction data. Still, digital dollars or euros held in bank accounts function like their physical counterparts: they do not expire, and they do not contain embedded instructions dictating their use.

What makes Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) fundamentally different is their potential to transform money into a programmable instrument. A CBDC is not merely a digital representation of currency—it is a new form of money designed within programmable digital architecture. This architecture allows for conditions to be hardcoded directly into the currency itself. A unit of CBDC could be designed to:

- Expire after a certain date
- Be spendable only on approved categories of goods
- Be restricted from crossing national borders
- Be frozen or redirected instantly by central authorities
- Enforce compliance with government mandates or social policies

The programmability of CBDCs introduces a radically new relationship between citizen and state. Unlike taxation or fines, which are imposed externally after a

transaction occurs, programmable money allows for preemptive control over what transactions can occur in the first place. This is paired with total traceability, meaning every transaction made with CBDCs could be recorded on a government-accessible ledger, enabling unprecedented levels of financial surveillance.

This evolution marks a turning point. Whereas money once served as a neutral instrument that empowered individuals to act freely within markets, programmable money repositions currency as a tool of behavioral governance. While such capabilities are often promoted under the banner of public good—such as fighting terrorism, preventing fraud, or encouraging stimulus spending—they open the door to deep intrusions into personal economic autonomy, with potential applications far beyond their original scope.

Understanding the rise of programmable money is essential to assessing the implications of CBDCs—not just as a financial innovation, but as a new architecture for governance, control, and compliance in modern society.

**III. Programmed Expiration and Behavioral Nudging**

One of the most controversial features under discussion in the design of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) is the possibility of programmed expiration. In contrast to traditional currency, which remains valid until physically destroyed or replaced by a new issue, a programmable CBDC could be designed to self-terminate or devalue after a predetermined period. This concept has already moved beyond theoretical consideration and into real-world experimentation.

China’s digital yuan (e-CNY) pilot programs have included expiration dates in certain test distributions. For instance, during a 2020 trial in Shenzhen, residents were given digital currency "red packets" containing 200 yuan (approximately $30 USD at the time), which had to be spent within a few weeks. If the funds were not used before the expiration date, they vanished. This effectively simulated a “use-it-or-lose-it” incentive, a form of behavioral nudging through financial design. The idea was not only to test digital infrastructure, but also to stimulate economic activity by forcing liquidity into the market.

Central banks and policymakers justify such expiration features with several arguments:

1. Stimulate Spending: Expiring money pushes consumers to spend quickly, boosting economic activity during recessions or slowdowns. It functions as a highly targeted and time-sensitive stimulus tool.
2. Prevent Hoarding: In times of economic crisis, people tend to save rather than spend, reducing the flow of money in the economy. Expiration dates could discourage hoarding behavior and keep money in circulation.
3. Enable Automatic Recovery: In the case of lost wallets or unused digital cash, programmable expiration could be tied to a mechanism that returns unspent funds to a central account, mitigating the loss of value due to inactivity or negligence.

Despite these potential advantages, the risks and ethical implications are profound:

- Forced Consumption: Expiration dates effectively coerce individuals into spending. This disrupts the individual's right to save or delay spending based on personal judgment or financial prudence. In this sense, expiration removes the traditional economic freedom associated with ownership of money.
- Reduced Financial Agency: For many people—especially those in precarious financial situations—the ability to save money is essential for emergencies, future planning, and autonomy. Programmed expiration undermines long-term financial strategies and exacerbates insecurity.
- Ethical Concerns: Governments programming individual financial behavior raises serious questions about consent, personal liberty, and economic coercion. Such tools may appear benign or even beneficial during times of crisis, but their long-term use could lead to a society in which financial behavior is increasingly shaped by algorithmic directives rather than human intention.

Additionally, there are broader philosophical questions about who gets to decide when and how money should expire, and on what grounds. Would expiration rules be applied uniformly, or would certain populations (e.g., the poor, the unemployed) be more heavily targeted in the name of economic efficiency?

As expiration features evolve from pilot studies into scalable features, the concern is not merely technical—it is foundational. Programmed expiration redefines the nature of ownership: if one's money can be taken away by design, then what does it mean to own money at all?

## IV. Purchase Restrictions and Social Engineering

While expiration dates on programmable currency raise concerns about forced consumption, an equally powerful—and perhaps more invasive—feature of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) lies in their ability to limit or restrict purchases. Programmable currency can be designed not only to disappear, but also to refuse to work for specific types of transactions. This introduces a mechanism by which governments could preemptively shape individual behavior—a phenomenon that moves well beyond monetary policy into the realm of social engineering.

With CBDCs, money becomes conditional. Governments or issuing authorities could designate which goods or services are acceptable or unacceptable for purchase using state-issued digital currency. Though this may sound dystopian, it has already been discussed publicly by prominent economists and institutions.

At the World Economic Forum, economist Eswar Prasad explained that CBDCs "could be programmed to determine what kind of things it can be spent on and what kind of things it cannot be spent on." He raised scenarios where governments could restrict spending on items they consider undesirable or socially harmful—such as alcohol, ammunition, gambling, or even certain types of media or entertainment. His remarks were framed as cautionary, but they underscored the real programmable potential inherent in CBDC design.

Examples of possible restrictions include:

- Public health initiatives: Prohibiting purchases of sugary beverages, tobacco, or fast food.
- Environmental policy: Blocking the purchase of gasoline-powered vehicles or air travel above certain carbon limits.
- Security policy: Restricting the sale of firearms or ammunition, particularly in areas deemed high-risk.
- Moral enforcement: Preventing transactions involving pornography, certain books or films, or politically controversial materials.
- Behavioral control: Conditioning receipt of social benefits or universal basic income on compliant spending.

Though often framed in terms of public good, these restrictions carry the seeds of unprecedented state control over private life. They invert the traditional relationship between government and individual in liberal societies. Rather than citizens deciding how to spend their earnings, the state—via code—would possess the ability to allow or deny purchases in real time, creating a programmable morality system baked into the economy.

The implications are wide-ranging:

- Surveillance: Every transaction is recorded, categorized, and assessed against allowable use-cases, resulting in comprehensive dossiers of individual behavior.
- Coercion: Citizens could be nudged, or outright forced, into compliance with state mandates by making noncompliance economically impossible.
- Economic Discrimination: Rules might not be applied equally. Individuals with criminal records, poor credit scores, or political dissidence could face tailored restrictions, effectively introducing financial punishment without due process.

Such systems could also be exploited for political purposes. If a future government decides to restrict donations to certain organizations, suppress dissenting voices by freezing assets, or reward loyalty with broader spending privileges, the architecture would already be in place. The granular programmability of CBDCs makes this not only possible, but potentially easy.

Moreover, these tools could be applied under emergency powers during a crisis—initially justified as temporary measures—only to become permanent features. The COVID-19 pandemic, for example, showed how quickly extraordinary measures can be normalized when framed as necessary for public safety.

In sum, the ability to restrict purchases via programmable currency opens the door to a form of economic governance that is preventive, preemptive, and profoundly personal. Once money becomes conditional, the individual's relationship to the state, to commerce, and even to their own labor begins to shift. A person no longer earns money to use freely—they are issued conditional credits whose usage can be monitored, filtered, or revoked.

The ethical stakes are high. In attempting to build a more controlled and optimized society, CBDCs risk replacing personal freedom with a programmable framework in which virtue and vice are determined by code.

## V. The Two-Tier System: How the Ultra-Wealthy Avoid Control

While Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) are often promoted as tools to improve economic equity and inclusion, the reality is likely to be far more stratified. The programmable nature of CBDCs opens a pathway to a two-tier economic system, where ordinary citizens are subjected to behavioral constraints and surveillance, while the ultra-wealthy operate largely outside these restrictions, shielded by access, influence, and alternative financial instruments. In essence, the same programmable tools that promise efficiency and oversight may reinforce and even magnify existing disparities in economic autonomy.

One of the primary ways the ultra-wealthy would evade CBDC restrictions is through asset diversification. Unlike the average citizen, who relies on salary and

savings held in government-backed currencies, the wealthy typically hold their value in non-liquid, non-centralized, or non-monetary assets such as:

- Real estate: A time-tested hedge against inflation and governmental overreach, real estate operates outside the reach of digital currency expiration or programmable spending rules.
- Precious metals: Gold and silver provide anonymous, decentralized stores of value immune to central bank code.
- Cryptocurrencies: Although volatile and still in regulatory flux, decentralized digital assets like Bitcoin or Ethereum offer programmability without state control—ironically providing the freedom that CBDCs lack.

Additionally, the ultra-wealthy can leverage jurisdictional arbitrage, the practice of shifting assets or residency to countries with more favorable regulatory climates. Nations that choose not to implement CBDCs, or that offer non-programmable alternatives, could become havens for capital flight. This is already observable in how high-net-worth individuals move funds to low-tax jurisdictions; the same logic applies to CBDC policy evasion. Entire families, businesses, or holding companies may relocate to preserve financial autonomy.

Another mechanism of avoidance lies in legal structures. Wealth is often protected and managed through trusts, corporations, foundations, and offshore entities, all of which can serve as firewalls against CBDC restrictions. While a citizen might be told they cannot purchase certain items with digital cash, a corporation or charitable trust may face no such constraints. The line between individual and institutional finance blurs quickly at the highest levels of wealth, enabling a kind of legal circumvention not available to the general population.

Moreover, it's likely that institutional exemptions will be quietly built into CBDC systems themselves. For economic or political stability, governments will be reluctant to impose full restrictions on banks, major investors, or essential industries. As a result, certain accounts—especially those classified as “institutional” or “commercial”—may not face expiration, spending limits, or surveillance to the same degree. These exemptions could be publicly justified as

necessary to ensure liquidity, but they also represent the formalization of tiered access to financial rights.

In addition to using existing power structures to avoid CBDC constraints, the ultra-wealthy often influence the very development of such systems. Through lobbying, philanthropic funding of central bank research, direct political contributions, and membership in elite policy forums such as the World Economic Forum, they shape the rules from the outset. It is unlikely that CBDC design and governance frameworks will be constructed without the participation—or tacit approval—of the most powerful financial players.

Finally, there is the emerging possibility of parallel financial systems. Private tokenized economies, decentralized finance (DeFi) platforms, and blockchain-based barter networks are already under development. Wealthy individuals and institutions could create closed-loop ecosystems where digital tokens—backed by real assets—circulate independently of national currencies. These private systems would offer freedom from programmable constraints, mirroring the role that private banking and offshore accounts have played for decades.

In sum, while CBDCs are framed as modern tools of democratized finance, their deployment may instead cement a dual financial architecture. The majority of people would operate in a tightly regulated, monitored digital economy, while a small elite moves fluidly through traditional assets, offshore structures, and emerging private networks. The result would not be a leveling of the financial field, but a deepening of its hierarchical structure, obscured by the illusion of universal inclusion.

## VI. The Illusion of Financial Equality in the Age of CBDCs

Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) are often promoted under the banner of financial inclusion. Proponents argue that by digitizing currency and distributing it directly via smartphones or national digital wallets, the unbanked and underbanked populations—often among the world's poorest—will gain access to the formal financial system. In theory, CBDCs could democratize access to banking

services, reduce transaction costs, and eliminate reliance on exploitative intermediaries such as payday lenders or remittance services.

Yet beneath this appealing narrative lies a deeper contradiction. The same technological capabilities that allow CBDCs to include more people in the financial system also allow unprecedented central control, surveillance, and manipulation of economic behavior. The result may not be financial equality, but the institutionalization of a new digital underclass—a system in which access comes with conditions, and participation requires submission.

As CBDCs consolidate financial power in the hands of central authorities, the potential for deepening existing inequalities becomes clear. For those with no alternative stores of value—no property, no hard assets, no foreign bank accounts—CBDCs may become the sole means of exchange, tying individuals completely to a programmable and surveilled system. Rules, restrictions, and expiration dates will apply most heavily to these users, justified as nudges for the public good or tools for macroeconomic stability.

Meanwhile, the wealthy, as previously outlined, will retain freedom by operating outside the system or above its constraints. This creates a bifurcation: one system of money for the governed, another for the exempt. It is financial inclusion in name, but exclusion in substance. Those who are "included" are included only to the extent that they accept algorithmic governance of their spending habits, savings patterns, and social behavior.

This reveals a core paradox of CBDC-based inclusion: it redefines inclusion not as access to free exchange, but as permissioned participation in a controlled economy. Inclusion becomes a framework for control. The poor and working classes—already subject to economic precarity—would now face an added layer of programmable compliance, where failure to align with state goals or social norms could limit access to funds, benefits, or basic transactions.

Such a system lays the groundwork for what may be described as a surveillance-driven caste system in finance. Unlike historical caste systems based on birth or ethnicity, this one is defined by algorithmic access and conditional trust.

Individuals may be categorized, scored, or monitored in ways that determine their financial privileges. Risk profiles, social behavior, medical status, or political views could all become variables in determining the terms of one's financial inclusion.

The implications are far-reaching:

- Social control through spending: What people can or cannot buy becomes a tool for behavioral enforcement.
- Dynamic compliance scoring: Real-time data from financial activity could influence one's access to housing, employment, or even geographic mobility.
- Reduced anonymity: The capacity for private financial life is nearly eliminated, as all transactions are tied to a digital identity.

What begins as a promise of equality ends as an infrastructure for differentiation and discrimination, cloaked in the language of fairness. In such a system, equality is defined not by equal freedom, but by equal exposure to control.

In short, the introduction of CBDCs threatens to shift financial equality from a question of opportunity to a matter of obedience. As programmability replaces autonomy, and surveillance replaces trust, the economic floor may be raised—but the ceiling of true freedom may be lowered, and placed further out of reach for all but a select few.

## VII. Global Trends and Public Responses

As Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) move from theory to practice, the global financial landscape is undergoing a profound transformation. Dozens of countries have launched pilot programs, initiated legislative studies, or entered development phases for CBDCs. While the pace and form of adoption vary, the momentum is undeniable: digital currencies are coming, and their implementation is being framed not as a question of *if*, but *when* and *how*.

According to the Atlantic Council's CBDC Tracker, as of 2025, over 130 countries, representing more than 98% of global GDP, are exploring or developing CBDCs. Eleven nations, including Nigeria, Jamaica, and several in the Eastern Caribbean, have fully launched retail CBDCs. Other major economies such as China, India, Sweden, and Brazil are in advanced pilot stages. Meanwhile, the European Central Bank (ECB) and the Bank of England are engaged in active design and consultation processes, with rollout timelines projected for the second half of this decade.

China has emerged as the global leader in the CBDC race, with its digital yuan (e-CNY) pilot extending across dozens of cities and reaching millions of users. The People's Bank of China has openly incorporated programmable features in its design trials, including expiration dates and conditional spending, framing these tools as methods to stimulate consumption and prevent fraud. The Chinese model is not just a technological prototype; it also serves as a political proof-of-concept for using programmable currency as a tool of governance.

However, this rapid movement toward programmable money has not gone uncontested. Privacy advocates, human rights groups, and civil liberty organizations have raised strong alarms about the potential misuse of CBDCs. Groups such as the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) and the Human Rights Foundation (HRF) argue that CBDCs, if improperly implemented, could become tools for mass surveillance, political repression, and financial exclusion. They warn that centralized control of digital money could undermine freedom of speech, association, and protest, especially in countries with authoritarian tendencies.

Concerns are not limited to advocacy groups. In the United States, CBDCs have become a flashpoint in the culture wars. While the Federal Reserve continues to research a digital dollar, it has stressed that no decision has been made and that any move would require congressional authorization. Nevertheless, several members of Congress have proposed legislation to prohibit or tightly regulate CBDC implementation, citing fears of government overreach. The "No CBDC Act," for example, introduced by U.S. Senator Ted Cruz and others, aims to prevent the Federal Reserve from issuing a direct-to-consumer digital dollar that could be used to track personal transactions.

In Europe, the rollout of the digital euro has been met with cautious optimism, but also scrutiny. The European Central Bank has repeatedly stated that the digital euro will not be programmable "by the central bank," yet it has left open the possibility that private-sector intermediaries could apply conditional logic to transactions. This ambiguity has led critics to question whether programmability will simply be outsourced rather than banned—thus achieving the same effect through different channels.

Across democracies, public skepticism is growing. A growing number of citizens are expressing concern that CBDCs, while presented as a convenience, may become the gateway to financial surveillance states. These fears are not unfounded; the infrastructure for control, once built, can be difficult to dismantle. And history offers many examples where emergency powers and exceptional technologies, introduced during moments of crisis, become permanent features of governance.

Meanwhile, alternative communities are forming around resistance to state-issued digital money. From cryptocurrency enthusiasts advocating for decentralized finance (DeFi), to political factions calling for legal protections for cash and anonymity, the CBDC debate is helping to reignite public interest in the nature of money itself—what it is, who controls it, and what freedoms it should enable or restrict.

In this way, global CBDC rollouts are not merely about financial modernization. They are catalyzing a broader conversation about the limits of state power, the meaning of personal autonomy, and the future architecture of civil society. Whether these currencies will empower or entrap depends largely on the public response and legal framework that accompanies their rise.

## VIII. Conclusion

The advent of programmable money through Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) represents one of the most significant financial transformations in modern history. What is being proposed is not merely a technological update to

traditional currency, but a fundamental redesign of how money functions within society. In the past, money has acted as a neutral instrument—an enabler of free exchange, private ownership, and economic self-determination. Programmable CBDCs challenge all of that by embedding conditions into the currency itself, shifting power from the individual to the issuer.

This transformation has far-reaching consequences. With programmability comes the ability to influence behavior at scale: to direct spending through expiration dates, to suppress or encourage transactions based on government priorities, and to monitor financial decisions with surgical precision. In essence, the state gains the unprecedented ability to code policy into currency, turning every transaction into a potential checkpoint of compliance.

The promise of CBDCs—greater financial inclusion, faster transactions, reduced fraud—is undeniably appealing. But these benefits come with significant trade-offs. The possibility of fine-grained control over personal finances raises deep concerns about civil liberties, privacy, and economic autonomy. What was once a cash economy governed by choice may become a digital economy governed by condition. The danger is not merely hypothetical. As pilot programs and policy discussions across the globe have shown, the tools for monetary control are real, and they are being actively developed.

This moment calls for more than quiet implementation by central banks and technocratic bodies. It demands public debate, transparent legislation, and clear ethical boundaries. The decision to embed behavioral restrictions in money should not be made behind closed doors or justified solely through technical rationales. It is a societal decision, one that requires the consent of the governed and a full understanding of what is at stake.

Moreover, there must be legal safeguards to ensure that programmable features do not become mechanisms of discrimination or instruments of authoritarianism. Clear lines must be drawn between legitimate economic policy tools and intrusions on personal freedom. If not, the CBDC could become a backdoor to a new model of governance—one in which compliance is not enforced through law, but through the silent limitations of digital code.

And yet, even as these risks loom, the asymmetry of impact remains unaddressed. While the average citizen may find themselves tethered to a programmable financial system with limited autonomy, the ultra-wealthy are poised to remain exempt. Through asset diversification, legal entities, offshore options, and political influence, they are likely to preserve financial freedom just as others are losing theirs.

Thus, the critical question remains:
In a world of programmable currency, will liberty have a price tag?
Will the freedom to spend, save, and own one's wealth become a privilege of the elite, while the rest navigate a matrix of digital conditions masked as modernization?

As CBDCs continue to move from conception to reality, the shape of our future economy—and the freedoms it may or may not afford—will depend not on the technology itself, but on how society chooses to govern its use. Now is the time to ask difficult questions, to demand transparency, and to ensure that in our pursuit of digital progress, we do not quietly program away the very freedoms that make progress worthwhile.

**References**


Atlantic Council. *Central Bank Digital Currency Tracker*. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/cbdctracker/

Bank of Canada. “Designing a CBDC for Offline Use: A Technical Perspective.” *Bank of Canada Staff Working Paper 2021-67*. December 2021. https://www.bankofcanada.ca/2021/12/staff-working-paper-2021-67/

Cato Institute. *The Risks of a Central Bank Digital Currency*. https://www.cato.org/visual-feature/risks-of-cbdcs/

Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF). “CBDCs and Surveillance: Potential Threats to Privacy.” https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2022/06/cbdcs-and-surveillance-potential-threats-privacy

Eswar Prasad. “The Future of Money.” Presentation and remarks at the *World Economic Forum*, 2021–2023. Summary coverage available at: https://www.sociable.co/government-and-policy/governments-program-cbdc-restrict-undesirable-purchases-wef-summer-davos-china/

European Central Bank. *Digital Euro – Frequently Asked Questions*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/digital_euro/html/index.en.html

Federal Reserve Board. “Money and Payments: The U.S. Dollar in the Age of Digital Transformation.” *Discussion Paper*, January 2022. https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/money-and-payments-discussion-paper.htm

Human Rights Foundation. *CBDC Tracker: Authoritarian Risk Assessment Tool*. https://cbdctracker.hrf.org/

Investopedia. “There Could Be 15 Retail CBDCs in Circulation by 2030.” March 2023. https://www.investopedia.com/there-could-be-15-retail-cbdcs-in-circulation-by-2030-7558451

Sociable. “Governments Could Program CBDCs to Restrict ‘Undesirable Purchases’: WEF Panel.” July 2023. https://sociable.co/government-and-policy/governments-program-cbdc-restrict-undesirable-purchases-wef-summer-davos-china/

U.S. Senate. “No CBDC Act.” Legislative proposals by Sen. Ted Cruz and colleagues. Bill summaries and status available via https://www.congress.gov

World Economic Forum. *Digital Currency Governance Consortium White Paper Series*. 2021–2024. https://www.weforum.org/whitepapers

How CBDCs Could Reshape Freedom, Privacy, and Power
CBDC